



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,041	04/15/2002	Belkacem Benyoub	099998.000010	7392
29540	7590	03/18/2005	EXAMINER	
PITNEY HARDIN LLP			NGUYEN, JENNIFER T	
7 TIMES SQUARE			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10036-7311			PAPER NUMBER	

2674

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/018,041

Applicant(s)

BENYOUB ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer T Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (Patent No.: US 5,815,606) in view of Oliveras et al. (WO 97/34253).

Regarding claim 1, Baker teaches a method for transforming by binarization processes a digital image (i.e., gray scale matrix) having several gray levels into a binary image (i.e., binary matrix) in which each pixel is coded over one bit, characterized in that the binarization processes is applied to each current pixel of the digital image and in that the binary values delivered at the output of the binarization processes for this current pixel so as to obtain a resultant binary value constituting the corresponding pixel of the binary image (col. 1, lines 60-63, col. 3, line 28 to col. 4, line 8, col. 4, line 63 to col. 5, line 36).

Baker differs from claim 1 in that he does not specifically teaches said binarization processes includes several different binarization processes are applied in parallel to each current pixel of the digital image and in that the binary values delivered in parallel at the output of the binarization processes are combined so as to obtain a resultant binary value constituting the corresponding pixel of the binary image. However, referring to Fig. 4, Oliveras teaches several different binarization processes (4112A-4112N) are applied in parallel to each current pixel of the digital image and in that the binary values delivered in parallel at the output of the binarization processes (4113) are combined so as to obtain a resultant binary value constituting the corresponding pixel of the binary image (page 18, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the parallel different binarization processes and combined step as taught by Oliveras in the

Art Unit: 2674

system of Baker in order to allow the best account to be taken of the diversity of printing of the characters in the digital images having several gray levels.

Regarding claim 2, Baker further teaches the binarization processes are performed within an automatic mail processing machine to binarize the digital image (10) of the face of mail item on which the destination address of the mail is printed (Fig. 1, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 59).

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al. (Patent No.: US 5,815,606) in view of Oliveras et al. (WO 97/34253) and further in view of Kobayashi et al. (EP 0 467 577).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Baker and Oliveras differs from claim 3 in that it does not specifically teaches one of the binarization processes is the output of a neural classifier. However, referring to Fig. 1, Kobayashi teaches a binarization processes is the output of a neural classifier (page 3, lines 44-57). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the neural classifier as taught by Kobayashi in the system of the combination of Baker and Oliveras in order to adapt the binarization process easily and efficiently.

4. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered to pertinent applicant's disclosure.

Chung (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,466) teaches system and method for converting a gray-level image into a binary image.

Art Unit: 2674

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer T Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7696. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri: 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edouard Patrick can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JNguyen
02/24/2005


REGINA LIANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER